

REMARKS

Applicant files herewith a Reply to the Restriction Requirement contained in an Office Action mailed May 30, 2007. This Reply includes an amendment to the claims.

Response to Restriction Requirement

The Office Action states that there are two (2) patentably distinct inventions contained in the present application:

- I. Group I, as drawn to Claims 1-6.
- II. Group II, as drawn to Claims 7-11.

The Office Action further states that inventions I and II are related as combination and sub-combination. A combination and sub-combination are distinct if it can be shown that the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed, and if it is shown that the sub-combination has separate utility. In the subject application, the Office Action finds that sub-combination Group II has separate utility from the combination of Group I. The Office Action further requires Applicant to elect a single Group of claims drawn to a single invention.

Applicant hereby elects Claims 1 – 6 in Group I for examination, subject to the claim amendments noted below.

Amendments

Applicant has amended the first six (6) paragraphs of the specification in order to provide updated information with respect to the application numbers, published patent application numbers, and issued patent numbers of the commonly owned applications that are referenced in these paragraphs. Applicant believes that these amendments do not add new matter to the application.

In view of the election of the Group I claims, independent method claim 7 and dependent claims 8 – 11 have been canceled from the present application.

Applicant has amended claims 1 – 6 in order to correct minor grammatical informalities and antecedent basis problems in the claim language therein. Applicant believes that these amendments do not add new matter to the application. With these amendments, there is no intent to narrow the scope of the claims or to affect the Doctrine of Equivalents as it might be applied to claims, were they unamended. These claim amendments are not being made as a requirement for patentability, and are believed to be merely cosmetic in nature. After entry of this amendment, claims 1 – 6 are pending in the subject application, including independent claim 1.

Request to Correct Inventorship pursuant to 37 CFR 1.48(b)

In this Reply, claims 7 – 11, the unelected set of claims, have been canceled.

Please delete the named inventor Candice Hellen Brown Elliott in the subject application. This inventor's invention is no longer the subject matter of the claims remaining to be prosecuted in this application.

Applicant is filing this amendment via EFS-Web and, pursuant to 37 CFR 1.48(b)(2), is concurrently authorizing payment of the processing fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(i) by deposit account.

Applicant is also concurrently filing a Supplemental Application Data Sheet stating the correct inventorship of the subject application.

Conclusion

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite the allowance of the claims, the Examiner is invited to contact Judith C. Bares at (408) 200-7386. .

Respectfully submitted,

/Judith C. Bares/

Judith C. Bares Reg. No. 35,824

Dated: June 20, 2007
Cupertino, CA